

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough examination of the claims as evidenced in the Office Action dated February 20, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections to the claims contained therein.

Claims 1, 9, 10, 18 and 20 have been amended by this Response. No claims have been cancelled or withdrawn. No new matter has been entered herein by the amendments hereto. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the active remote sensing technology" recited therein. Applicant has amended claim 9 to depend from claim 8, which includes antecedent basis for the phrase in question. Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,011,505 to Poehler, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,125,329 to Place, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Poehler discloses a method for terrain elevation measurement using interferometric synthetic aperture radar (IFSAR). Multiple radar passes are interpolated or averaged to provide an accurate terrain map. Photogrammetry is mentioned as an option in the interpolation/averaging steps that are shown in Figures 7-10. Place discloses the use of orthorectification coefficients to enhance mapping accuracy.

In contrast, applicant's invention as recited in amended claim 1 includes comparing two sets of data to identify information describing a terrain feature that is not present in one of the sets of data, replacing the subset of the first set of data with the subset of the second set of data when information describing a terrain feature is not present in the first set of data because of a first type of error, and replacing the subset of the second set of data with the subset of the first set of data when information describing a terrain feature is not present in the second set of data because of a second type of error that is characteristically different from the first type of error. Neither Poehler nor Place disclose or teach *replacing* data, but instead teach the averaging or interpolation of two independent data sets. Claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claims 2-9

depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to recite identifying errors in the database by determining whether information in the database describing a terrain feature is different from information in the data set describing the terrain feature, and replacing the information in the database describing the terrain feature with the information from data set describing the terrain feature when the difference therebetween is due to the characteristic error type of the remote sensing technology. As explained with respect to claim 1, the cited references do not disclose or teach replacing information in the database with information in the data set, and further do not disclose or teach such replacement when the differences between the database and the data set is due to the characteristic error type of the remote sensing technology. Claim 10 is therefore allowable. Claims 11-17 depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 10 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons claim 10 is allowable.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to recite replacing the information in the database relating to the inaccurately represented obstacles and terrain features with information in the data set relating to the inaccurately represented information when the inaccurate representation is due to the characteristic error type of the remote sensing technology. As previously explained with respect to allowable claims 1 and 10, the cited references teach the averaging or interpolation, and not the claimed replacement of information in a database with information in a data set, as recited in claim 18. Furthermore, the cited references do not discuss replacement when an inaccurate representation of obstacles and terrain features in the database is due to the characteristic error type of the remote sensing technology, as also recited in claim 18. Claim 18 is therefore allowable. Claims 19-20 depend from allowable claim 18 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons claim 18 is allowable.

Accordingly, with entry of the amendments and consideration of the arguments and remarks contained herein, all pending claims are now allowable, and a notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if further issues remain in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nathan O. Jensen  
Nathan O. Jensen  
Reg. No. 41,460  
Attorney for Applicant

Rockwell Collins Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498  
Telephone: (319) 295-1184  
Facsimile No. (319) 295-8777  
Customer No.: 26383